

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,208	08/24/2001	Gregory E. Agoston	05213-0852 (43170-263550)	3573
75	90 12/03/2004		EXAM	INER
John S. Pratt			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP Suite 2800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1100 Peachtree Street			1616	
Atlanta, GA 3	0309-4530	`	DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/939,208	AGOSTON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sabiha Qazi	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
riod for Reply		MONTH/O) FROM				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		thirty (30) days will be considered timely. **NONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.** **ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
atus						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27	<u>July 2004</u> .					
, —··· •						
	The second section is a second section of the section of the section is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
isposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>93-96</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·					
6) Claim(s) <u>93-96</u> is/are rejected.	· ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	,					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
pplication Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attac	hed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
ttachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ew Summary (PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	08) 5) 🔲 Notice	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Patent and Trademark Office						

Art Unit: 1616

Final Rejection

Acknowledgement is made of the response filed on 7/30/04. Amendments are entered. Claims 93-96 are pending.

Rejection over US 5763432 and 6,046,186 (Tanabe et al.) and 112 (2) are withdrawn because claims are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 94 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fishman et al., AN CA54: 18587 f CAOLD. See compound of RN 52717-98-3 HCAOLD which is estradiol, 2-methoxy, 17 acetate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1616

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 93-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,046,186. The reference teaches a homologue of the compound of claim 93 and 94. See the entire document especially compound 68 in col. 49. Instant claims are considered obvious when the substituent at 17-position (Rg) represents =CH2, =CH2CH3, =CH2CH3CH2

The prior art of record is drawn to structurally similar compounds, which differ, from the compounds embraced by the instant claims in that they are homologues. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the teaching of the prior art to prepare homologues because it is recognized in the art that homologues are structurally similar and would be expected to possess similar properties. *Ex parte Henze* (POBA 1948) 83 USPQ 167.

Compounds that differ only by the presence of an extra methyl group are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders prima facie obvious its homologue.

The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have the same properties. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. See *In re*

Art Unit: 1616

Wood 199 USPQ 137; In re Hoke 195 USPQ 148; In re Lohr 137 USPQ 548; In re Magerlein 202 USPQ 473; In re Wiechert 152 USPQ 249; Ex parte Henkel 130 USPQ 474; In re Fauque 121 USPQ 425; In re Druey 138 USPQ 39.

In absence of any criticality/and or unobvious property presently claimed invent tion is considered obvious over the prior art of record.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1616

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The

examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on (571) 272-0887. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monday, November 29, 2004

SABIHA QAZI, PH.U PRIMARY EXAMINER

5.0Bg/